

June, 1992

LBL-31066

UCB-PTH-91/34

Walking Technicolor and Electroweak Radiative Corrections

Raman Sundrum

*Department of Physics
University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720
and
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720*

Stephen D.H. Hsu*

*Lyman Laboratory of Physics
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138*

Abstract

We examine the effect of walking technicolor dynamics on the electroweak S parameter and contrast it with the effect of QCD-like technicolor dynamics. Our main tools are the operator product expansion for the high-momentum behavior of the electroweak gauge boson vacuum polarizations and the analyticity of these polarizations which relate their low and high momentum behaviors. We show that whereas in large QCD-like technicolor models S is large and positive, in walking technicolor models a negative contribution is emphasized, related to the large anomalous dimension of the technifermion condensate. Thus in walking technicolor S is determined by a large cancellation of two competing effects. This may result in much smaller values of S than in QCD-like technicolor, although considerable uncertainties are involved. We conclude that it is impossible to rule out walking technicolor based on the present experimental limits on S and the present theoretical technology.

*Junior Fellow, Harvard Society of Fellows

1 Introduction

There has been a great deal of interest recently [1, 2] in possibly large effects on precision electroweak observables due to isospin-preserving technicolor (TC) dynamics. As noted by Peskin and Takeuchi [2], the largest isospin-preserving effects from the electroweak symmetry breaking sector enter into physical observables through a single combination of electroweak vacuum polarizations which they call S . (See refs. [2] for the S dependence of precision observables.) Although it has been appreciated for some time that isospin violation in the electroweak Higgs sector is severely constrained by the experimental value of the ρ (or T) parameter, it is comparatively recently that strong experimental limits have been placed on S . Experiments currently favor a negative value of S .

Most discussions of the S parameter (or closely related parameters) within technicolor theories have focussed on what we will call ‘QCD-like’ technicolor (QTC). Such theories are taken to have dynamics very similar to QCD, supplemented by extended technicolor (ETC) four-fermion interactions which communicate the chiral symmetry breaking of the strong technicolor sector to ordinary fermions in order to give them masses [3]. The non-perturbative properties of such theories are estimated by the appropriate re-scalings of QCD properties. In particular, it is possible to compute S in such theories by organizing the calculation so that it depends on measured QCD quantities [2]. The result is that theories with large numbers of technifermions give large, positive values of S , which are difficult to reconcile with experiment. The advantage of trying to use QCD-like dynamics in TC theories is that their properties are the easiest to determine given our knowledge of QCD. The disadvantage is that it is very difficult to construct models with ETC interactions of sufficient strength to give realistic masses to the ordinary fermions, while at the same time forbidding other ETC interactions which mediate unacceptably strong flavor changing neutral currents (FCNC’s) [4].

Walking technicolor (WTC) [5, 6] was proposed as a possible resolution of the problem of fermion masses and FCNC’s. It was shown that a class of theories with slowly running (or ‘walking’) technicolor couplings would produce enhanced technifermion condensates, leading to larger masses for ordinary fermions, while maintaining ETC mass scales sufficiently large to satisfactorily

suppress FCNC's. Whether or not fermion masses as large as that of the top quark can be accommodated within theories incorporating WTC is still an open question. WTC theories generally contain a large number of technifermions, needed to slow the running of the technicolor coupling, so if calculations of S performed assuming QCD-like dynamics were to apply to WTC, unacceptably large values of S would result.

In this paper we study the differences between WTC and QTC in their effects on the S parameter. Our starting point will be the 'dispersive approach' of Peskin and Takeuchi, where S is expressed as an integral over the TC spectrum in the isospin-one vector and axial-vector channels, weighted towards the infrared. Then, for QTC one can use experimental knowledge of the QCD spectrum to estimate S . Unfortunately, calculating the spectrum of a WTC theory is a strong interaction problem which we cannot solve. Instead, we will apply the ACD (analytic continuation by duality) [7] technique in order to estimate S .

The central observation of the ACD method relevant to our problem is that solving for the spectrum of the strongly interacting theory is solving a harder problem than necessary. After all, the Peskin-Takeuchi formula for S is a weighted mean of the TC spectrum and the details of the spectrum do not have to be known if one can get at S directly. To this end we apply the ACD method. First, S , a low-momentum quantity from the point of view of the TC theory, is expressed in terms of the high-momentum (compared with the TC-scale) expansion of the electroweak vacuum polarizations. This expression follows is obtained by exploiting the analyticity properties of the vacuum polarizations which relate high and low momenta. The requisite high-momentum behavior is estimated by applying the operator product expansion (OPE) to products of electroweak currents.

Our final result for the class of WTC and QTC models we consider is roughly

$$\begin{aligned} S_{QTC} &\sim (4.5f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 - 0.015)N_D N_{TC} - 0.03N_D, \\ S_{WTC} &\sim (4.5f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 - 0.07c)N_D N_{TC} - 0.03N_D. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here, N_D is the number of techni-doublets, N_{TC} is the number of technicolors, f_{TC} is the decay constant of the eaten Goldstone particles of the theory

($246 \text{ GeV}/\sqrt{N_D}$), and m_C is the technifermion constituent mass. c is a positive constant which is of order one but whose exact value cannot be determined. It is related to an OPE coefficient function. The QTC result is robust because we can estimate f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 from QCD, and we find that the corresponding (positive) contribution to S dominates. Therefore even if the resemblance to QCD is not perfect, we can safely say that large QTC models of this sort will have large positive S , $\sim 0.1N_DN_{TC}$ (which agrees with [2]). For WTC we cannot reach this conclusion. The two largest contributions, $4.5f_{TC}^2/m_C^2N_DN_{TC}$ and $-0.07cN_DN_{TC}$ have opposite sign and are of the same order, but they are not precisely known.

Thus, S_{WTC} is the result of a large, uncertain cancellation and may be quite small. This makes it impossible at present to definitively rule out WTC theories. We believe that our estimate of S_{WTC} is the best one can do with the present understanding of WTC dynamics and without making ad hoc assumptions about the details of the WTC spectrum. More than just the final answer though, our approach makes manifest the link between the characteristic large anomalous dimension of the technifermion bilinear in WTC and the potential for a substantial reduction in S over QTC.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we describe the class of TC theories we are considering, define S , and derive the Peskin-Takeuchi dispersive form for S in our notation. In Section 3, the ACD method is applied to the problem of determining S in TC, using the large-momentum expansion of the electroweak polarizations as input. In Section 4, the general form of the large-momentum expansion is determined using the OPE. In Section 5, we use the ACD method to calculate S in the simplest TC setting, minimal technicolor. In Section 6, the ACD method is applied to WTC and the result compared with QTC. We present our conclusions in Section 7.

2 The Peskin-Takeuchi formula

In this paper, for the purpose of discussing S , we restrict our attention to a class of simplified theories which we believe retain the essential features of more realistic TC theories. We consider N_D identical doublets of massless technifermions, $\Psi_j = (U_j, D_j)$, which transform under $SU(2)_{EW} \times U(1)_Y$ and a vectorial tech-

nicolor gauge symmetry, $SU(N_{TC})$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
(U, D)_L &= (2, 0, N_{TC}) \\
U_R &= (1, 1, N_{TC}) \\
D_R &= (1, -1, N_{TC}).
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The strong TC force spontaneously breaks the technifermion chiral symmetries, $SU(2N_D)_L \times SU(2N_D)_R \rightarrow SU(2N_D)_V$. This breaks EW symmetry in the correct way to give mass to the weak gauge bosons. Of the Goldstone bosons produced, three are eaten by the weak gauge bosons while the remainder are physical. Their common Goldstone decay constant must be $f_{TC} = 246 \text{ GeV}/\sqrt{N_D}$ in order to ensure the correct masses for the electroweak gauge bosons. Technifermion chiral symmetries are also explicitly broken by ETC four-technifermion interactions. We consider a simple form for the ETC interactions which explicitly breaks the chiral symmetry $SU(2N_D)_L \times SU(2N_D)_R \rightarrow SU(N_D)_V \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$. Ref. [8] gives the form of the ETC interactions which accomplish this, although we will not need it explicitly in this paper. Here, $SU(N_D)_V$ symmetry reflects the fact that the simplified choice of ETC interactions does not distinguish the N_D technifermion doublets, $SU(2)_L$ is just the gauged $SU(2)_{EW}$, and $U(1)_Y$ is a subgroup of $SU(2)_R$. In the absence of electroweak interactions (but taking into account the ETC interactions) there is a preserved symmetry group $SU(N_D)_V \times SU(2)_V$. $SU(2)_V$ is the custodial isospin symmetry which protects the Peskin-Takeuchi T parameter. A realistic ETC theory would violate this symmetry to some extent but since T is not the focus of this paper we have kept $SU(2)_V$ as a symmetry of the ETC and TC dynamics. The explicit chiral symmetry breaking will give all the physical Goldstone bosons a common mass (they are all in the same $SU(N_D)_V \times SU(2)_V$ multiplet), making them pseudo-Goldstone bosons (PGB's).

In general, S is defined in terms of the two-point function of the technifermion current coupled to the third component of weak isospin and the technifermion current coupled to hypercharge. The electroweak interactions are neglected within this correlator. To be more precise, let J_μ^a and J_μ^Y denote the technifermion $SU(2)_{EW}$ and $U(1)_Y$ currents respectively. Because they are

conserved their two-point function has the form,

$$i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | T^* (J_\mu^3(x) J_\nu^Y(0)) | 0 \rangle = (q_\mu q_\nu - g_{\mu\nu} q^2) \Pi^{3Y}(s), \quad (3)$$

where $s = q^2$. S is then defined as

$$S = -8\pi(\Pi_{TC}^{3Y}(0) - \Pi_{MSM}^{3Y}(0)), \quad (4)$$

where the second term is the analogous polarization for the minimal standard model Higgs sector with a 1 TeV Higgs mass. That is, S measures deviations from the minimal standard model predictions for precision observables.

To exploit the flavor symmetry of our class of TC models we define technifermion currents,

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu^{aj} &= \bar{\Psi}^j \gamma_\mu \frac{\tau_a}{2} \Psi^j \\ A_\mu^{aj} &= \bar{\Psi}^j \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{\tau_a}{2} \Psi^j, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where j is not summed over and labels one of the N_D doublets, and τ_a are the Pauli matrices. The currents defined above are triplets, $a = 1, 2, 3$, of custodial isospin. By Eq. (2),

$$\begin{aligned} J_\mu^a &= \sum_j \frac{1}{2} (V_\mu^{aj} - A_\mu^{aj}), \\ J_\mu^Y &= \sum_j (V_\mu^{3j} + A_\mu^{3j}). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

By $SU(N_D)_V$ and parity invariance we then have,

$$\langle 0 | T^* (J_\mu^3(x) J_\nu^Y(0)) | 0 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_D} (\langle 0 | T^* (V_\mu^{3j}(x) V_\nu^{3j}(0)) | 0 \rangle - \langle 0 | T^* (A_\mu^{3j}(x) A_\nu^{3j}(0)) | 0 \rangle). \quad (7)$$

These new two-point functions can also be expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | T^* (V_\mu^{3j}(x) V_\nu^{3j}(0)) | 0 \rangle &= (q_\mu q_\nu - g_{\mu\nu} q^2) \Pi^V(s), \\ i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | T^* (A_\mu^{3j}(x) A_\nu^{3j}(0)) | 0 \rangle &= (q_\mu q_\nu - g_{\mu\nu} q^2) \Pi^A(s). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Again there is no summation over j but nevertheless the right-hand sides are independent of j by the flavor symmetry. It is also useful to define

$$\Pi = \Pi^V - \Pi^A \quad (9)$$

Then,

$$S = -4\pi(N_D\Pi(0) - \Pi_{MSM}^{3Y}(0)). \quad (10)$$

In the class of theories we will look at, working with $\Pi(t)$ will allow us to look at contributions to S *per doublet*, the only significant N_D dependence appearing explicitly as above.

Peskin and Takeuchi's ‘dispersive formula’ for S uses the spectral representation for $\Pi(t)$ for complex momentum-squared, t ,

$$\Pi(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty ds \frac{\text{Im}\Pi(s)}{t - s + i\epsilon}, \quad (11)$$

This expresses the polarization $\Pi(t)$ in terms of $\text{Im}\Pi(s) = \text{Im}\Pi_V - \text{Im}\Pi_A$, where $\text{Im}\Pi_{V,A}$ are the technicolor spectra in the isospin-one vector and axial channels. The above integral is ultra-violet convergent as the vector and axial spectra cancel asymptotically. From Eq. (10) we obtain the Peskin-Takeuchi formula,

$$S = 4 \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s} (N_D \text{Im}\Pi_{TC}(s) - \text{Im}\Pi_{MSM}^{3Y}(s)). \quad (12)$$

Because the electroweak interactions are turned off within the vacuum polarizations appearing in the formula for S the true Goldstones are present and massless. The Π 's have been normalized so that the Goldstone pole appears in $\text{Im}\Pi_A$ as

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im}\Pi_A = f_{TC}^2 \delta(s) + \dots \quad (13)$$

The integral over $\text{Im}\Pi(s)_{TC}$ in Eq. (12) diverges in the infrared because of the true Goldstone pole in the axial channel and the arbitrarily light multi-Goldstone states in both channels. However these divergences are eliminated by the subtraction of the contributions of the analogous Goldstone states in the standard model Higgs sector. We will say some more about this subtraction in the next section. The massive PGB's do not contribute to the infrared divergence.

Now that we have specified what it is we wish to calculate, we proceed to develop the means to do so.

3 The ACD method

In this section we develop the formulas for calculating S within the class of theories we are considering. From the spectral representation, Eq. (11), it

is clear that $\Pi(t)$, even at large t , depends on the whole spectrum, $\text{Im}\Pi(s)$. In particular it depends on the low-energy part of the spectrum. The ACD method attacks the inverse problem of calculating quantities depending smoothly on the low-energy spectrum, like S , by exploiting the behavior of $\Pi(t)$ for large t . Below, we describe our adaptation of the ACD method for calculating S in TC.

Our first task will be to immediately perform the MSM subtraction by subtracting the MSM spectrum from that of TC. The MSM spectrum is dominated by the Goldstone pole in the axial channel and the two-Goldstone states in the vector channel. The Higgs mass acts as a cutoff for these contributions. For all intents and purposes, this will coincide with the TC spectrum below some sufficiently low scale s_0 , which we will fix later. We will choose the Higgs mass-squared to be s_0 . (In our later calculations this will turn out to be roughly 1 TeV^2 , the value chosen by Peskin and Takeuchi in defining S . In any case S is not very sensitive to this choice of the Higgs mass.) Now the effect of the MSM subtraction can be stated simply: the effective spectrum is that of the TC theory above s_0 and zero below. Thus S can be written

$$S = 4N_D \int_{s_0}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{s} \text{Im}\Pi(s). \quad (14)$$

Corresponding to the subtracted spectrum we define,

$$\overline{\Pi}(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{s_0}^{\infty} ds \frac{\text{Im}\Pi(s)}{t - s + i\epsilon}, \quad (15)$$

for which we wish to compute the large- t behavior. We will obtain the large- t behavior of Π by using the OPE. The general form will be

$$\Pi(t) \sim h_0 + h_1/t + h_2/t^2 + h_3/t^3 + \dots \quad (16)$$

where the h_n depend weakly on t . By noticing that

$$\overline{\Pi}(t) = \Pi(t) - \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{s_0} ds \frac{\text{Im}\Pi(s)}{t - s + i\epsilon}, \quad (17)$$

the large- t behavior for $\overline{\Pi}$ follows,

$$\overline{\Pi}(t) \sim h_0 + (h_1 - f_{TC}^2 + s_0/48\pi^2)/t + (h_2 + s_0^2/96\pi^2)/t^2 + h_3/t^3 + \dots \quad (18)$$

That is, we have taken Eq. (16) and removed the contributions of the Goldstone pole and the two-Goldstone states below s_0 and expanded in $1/t$, where the

couplings to the currents are determined in a chiral lagrangian. Other multi-Goldstone contributions make negligible contributions.

Now we use the ACD trick [7]. Let R be a mass-squared large enough so that the above expansion makes sense for $|t| \geq R$ and t away from the physical axis. Consider the two closed contours in Fig. 1. By Eq. (15), $\bar{\Pi}$ is analytic in the regions enclosed by both the contours. For any polynomial of finite degree $P(t) = \sum_n a_n t^n$, applying Cauchy's theorem to the integral of $\bar{\Pi}(t)P(t)$ over $C = C_1 + C_2$ and $\bar{\Pi}(t)/t$ over $D = D_1 - C_1$ we find, using Eq. (15),

$$4N_D \int_{s_0}^R ds \text{Im}\Pi(s)P(s) = -2iN_D \int_{C_1} dt \bar{\Pi}(t)P(t), \quad (19)$$

$$4N_D \int_R^\infty ds \frac{\text{Im}\Pi(s)}{s} = 2iN_D \int_{C_1} dt \frac{\bar{\Pi}(t)}{t}, \quad (20)$$

The ACD technique consists of choosing $P(s)$ to approximate the behavior of the weight function in question, in this case $1/s$, for real s in the range s_0 to R . Then clearly by Eq. (14) the left-hand sides of Eqs. (19,20) add up to S ,

$$S \simeq 2iN_D \int_{C_1} dt \bar{\Pi}(t)(1/t - P(t)). \quad (21)$$

If we use the expansion, Eq. (18), to approximate $\bar{\Pi}$ on C_1 and *if* we can neglect any t dependence in the h_n , we can complete C_1 to a circle in Eq. (21) and apply Cauchy's formula, yielding,

$$\begin{aligned} S &\simeq 4\pi N_D [h_0 - (h_1 - f_{TC}^2 + s_0/48\pi^2)a_0 \\ &\quad - (h_2 + s_0^2/96\pi^2)a_1 - h_3 a_2 - \dots]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

(If the t dependence of an h_n is not negligibly weak then one must keep it and calculate the right-hand side of Eq. (21) without the aid of Cauchy's formula.) Note that the integrand in Eq. (21) contains the factor $(1/t - P(t))$. Because $P(t)$ is chosen to make this factor approximate zero *on the physical axis*, the contour integral representation for S is dominated by t far away from the axis. This is where the OPE is expected to be most trustworthy. We will illustrate this point later.

4 The operator product expansion

We now turn to the large- t expansion for $\Pi(t)$. The important tool here is the OPE for the product of currents in the vacuum polarization. The product of currents transforms in the $(1,3,3)$ representation of $SU(N_D)_V \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$, a symmetry of the dynamics, so all local operators appearing in its OPE must carry the same representation (whether or not the vacuum is symmetric) [9]. This is a strong constraint on the form of the OPE.

To begin, we neglect the ETC interactions in the theory and concentrate on the TC dynamics. Then, for large spacelike momentum $q^2 = -Q^2 < 0$, $\Pi(Q^2)$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(Q^2) \sim & C_6(Q/\mu, \alpha(\mu)) \frac{\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_\mu^2}{Q^6} \\ & + C_8(Q/\mu, \alpha(\mu)) \frac{\langle \bar{\psi} F_{\alpha\beta} \sigma^{\alpha\beta} \psi \rangle_\mu \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_\mu}{Q^8} \\ & + C_{10}(Q/\mu, \alpha(\mu)) \frac{\langle \bar{\psi} F_{\alpha\beta} \sigma^{\alpha\beta} \psi \rangle_\mu^2}{Q^{10}} \\ & + C'_{10}(Q/\mu, \alpha(\mu)) \frac{\langle \bar{\psi} F_{\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta} \psi \rangle_\mu \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_\mu}{Q^{10}} + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $F_{\alpha\beta}$ is the technigluon field strength, ψ represents any fermion flavor (which flavor is unimportant by the flavor symmetry) and μ is the arbitrary renormalization scale. The vacuum expectations of the operators appearing in the OPE have been factorized in a vacuum dominance approximation into products of technifermion bilinears. This becomes exact in leading order in a large- N_{TC} approximation. The standard large- N_{TC} approximation suppresses technifermion loops which are crucial for the walking of the gauge coupling in WTC theories. In appendix 1 we describe the modification of large- N_{TC} counting necessary to accomodate walking dynamics. Vacuum dominance continues to hold in the modified scheme. This is the most general expansion subject to the $SU(N_D)_V \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetry.

It is convenient to express the condensates involving the technigluon fields as a product of a ‘default’ estimate, multiplied by a possible correction factor.

For QCD-like theories at least it is natural to guess that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \bar{\psi} F_{\alpha\beta} \sigma^{\alpha\beta} \psi \rangle_\mu &\sim \sqrt{N_{TC}} \Lambda_{TC}^2 \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_\mu, \\ \langle \bar{\psi} F_{\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta} \psi \rangle_\mu &\sim N_{TC}^2 \Lambda_{TC}^4 \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_\mu.\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

Using this and choosing $\mu = Q$, leads to an expansion of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi(Q^2) &\sim C_6(\alpha(Q)) \frac{\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_Q^2}{Q^6} \\ &+ a(Q) C_8(\alpha(Q)) \frac{\sqrt{N_{TC}} m_C^2 \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_Q^2}{Q^8} \\ &+ b(Q) C_{10}(\alpha(Q)) \frac{N_{TC} m_C^4 \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_Q^2}{Q^{10}} \\ &+ b'(Q) C'_{10}(\alpha(Q)) \frac{N_{TC}^2 m_C^4 \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_Q^2}{Q^{10}}\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

The coefficients $a(Q), b(Q), b'(Q)$ are the correction factors referred to above.

5 Minimal TC

In order to illustrate and verify our procedure in a simple setting we first compute S for minimal technicolor (MTC). These are the QTC models with $N_D = 1$, so there are no PGB's.

Calculating the coefficient functions perturbatively (and in large- N_{TC} approximation) leads to the expansion

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi(Q^2) &\sim -4\pi \alpha(Q) \frac{\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_Q^2}{Q^6} \\ &+ a(Q) (4\pi \alpha(Q))^{3/2} \frac{\sqrt{N_{TC}} m_C^2 \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_Q^2}{Q^8} \\ &+ b(Q) (4\pi \alpha(Q))^2 \frac{N_{TC} m_C^4 \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_Q^2}{Q^{10}} + \dots\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

In MTC we expect $a(Q), b(Q) \sim O(1)$, which agrees with phenomenological QCD estimates [10]. The Q dependence of the technifermion condensate is

easily determined by the perturbative anomalous dimension,

$$\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_Q \sim \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_{2m_C} \left(\frac{\alpha(2m_C)}{\alpha(Q)} \right)^{9/22}. \quad (27)$$

From QCD we estimate,

$$\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_{2m_C} \sim -0.12 N_{TC} m_C^3. \quad (28)$$

(For $N_C = 3$, $m_C = 350 \text{ MeV}$, this gives $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_{2m_C} \sim -(250 \text{ MeV})^3$.) Using this and continuing to complex t ,

$$\Pi(t) \sim 0.4 N_{TC} m_C^6 / t^3 + 2a(t) N_{TC} m_C^8 / t^4 + 15b(t) N_{TC} m_C^{10} / t^5 + \dots \quad (29)$$

The non-canonical t dependence in the dominant term is extremely weak and we have therefore neglected it. We took $\alpha(2m_C) \sim 2.5/N_{TC}$.

We must now choose s_0 and R . Judging from QCD, the non-negligible tail of the techni- ρ persists down to $\sim \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \sim 2.5 m_C^2$. Below this however the MTC spectrum is given by the Goldstone states. Therefore we choose $s_0 = 2.5 m_C^2$. We will trust the expansion to make sense above $R = 25 m_C^2$ (in QCD this would be 3 GeV^2). Between s_0 and R we have the approximation $1/t \sim P(t)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} P(t) &= 0.65/m_C^2 - 0.14t/m_C^4 + 0.013t^2/m_C^6 \\ &- 0.0006t^3/m_C^8 + 8 \times 10^{-6}t^4/m_C^{10}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

A comparison is made in Fig. 2. A higher degree polynomial will only emphasize the unknown higher dimension condensate contributions in Eq. (22) and not improve our final accuracy.

The ACD formulas of Section 3 now yield

$$S = (8.2 f_{TC}^2 / m_C^2 - 0.065 \pm 0.015) N_{TC} - 0.03, \quad (31)$$

where the $\pm 0.015 N_{TC}$ is due to the uncertainty incorporated in a, b . The last ingredient is the estimate from QCD,

$$f_{TC}^2 = 0.024 N_{TC} m_C^2. \quad (32)$$

Putting this in,

$$S_{MTC} \sim (0.13 \pm 0.015) N_{TC} - 0.03. \quad (33)$$

The other uncertainty in this computation is the fit error between $P(t)$ and $1/t$ which we will not discuss because MTC is not the main focus of this paper. It is small and the reasoning is very similar to that given for the WTC case in appendix 2. The term subleading in $1/N_{TC}$ is due to MSM-subtracted two-Goldstone states. Although formally subleading, it is not quite negligible for moderate N_{TC} . Our result can be compared with the estimates of Peskin and Takeuchi [2]

$$S_{MTC} \sim 0.22, 0.32, 0.45, \quad (34)$$

for $N_{TC} = 2, 3, 4$ respectively.

An interesting feature of our calculation is that the dominant contribution to S_{MTC} comes from the f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 term of the $\overline{\Pi}(t)$ expansion. The appearance of this term is easy to understand. The fact that chiral symmetry forbids the appearance of a $1/t$ term in the large- t expansion of $\Pi(t)$ can be used to prove the first Weinberg sum rule [9, 11]. This states that the total weight in the vector channel is exactly the same as the total weight in the axial channel. However in calculating S we remove the Goldstone pole as part of the MSM subtraction. This means that the effective weight in the axial channel is reduced by f_{TC}^2 , favoring positive S . The information we obtain from the non-perturbative condensates concerns the distributional aspects of the spectral weights in the two channels.

6 Walking technicolor

We now examine S in WTC. We first need to discuss the following ingredients: (i) the OPE coefficient functions, (ii) the condensates, (iii) the effects of the ETC interactions, (iv) the value of f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 .

(i) An important observation about the large-momentum expansion, Eq. (25), is that the coefficient functions C_i all depend on Q only through $\alpha(Q)$. Therefore this dependence is very weak in WTC since α runs very slowly, so we will treat the C_i as constants from here on. In a WTC theory with anomalous dimension ~ 1 for $\overline{\psi}\psi$, ladder diagram analysis suggests that

$$\alpha(Q)_{WTC} \sim 2\pi/(3N_{TC}), \quad (35)$$

in the walking region above $2m_C$ [6]. Thus unlike MTC and QCD, the coupling does not rapidly become perturbatively small as Q increases. This means the constants C_i cannot be very accurately determined by perturbative means because higher order corrections are not suppressed. But we can at least say that the exact C_i are naturally of the same order as the leading perturbative estimates for them. For C_6 we can also determine the sign, which is important. Because WTC is a vector-like gauge theory, $\Pi(Q^2)$ is negative for all $Q^2 > 0$ [12]. This can be seen in Eq. (11) for spacelike momentum, $t = -Q^2$. We will be considering Q^2 large enough so that the large-momentum expansion should be reliable and the dominant term appearing in it determines the sign of $\Pi(Q^2)$. Thus $C_6 < 0$. We will show that this corresponds to a substantial negative contribution to S_{WTC} .

(ii) The key dynamical input from WTC is the renormalization-scale dependence of the technifermion condensate. Let us consider the extreme situation in which the anomalous dimension of $\bar{\psi}\psi$ is one. The picture of the technifermion self-energy $\Sigma(p)$ is then [6],

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(p) &\sim m_C, \quad |p| < 2m_C, \\ &\sim m_C^2/p, \quad |p| > 2m_C \text{ and in the walking region,} \\ &\sim m_C^3/p^2, \quad |p| \text{ so large that } \alpha_{TC}(p) \text{ is perturbatively small.}\end{aligned}\quad (36)$$

Therefore for moderate $\mu > 2m_C$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_\mu &= -\frac{N_{TC}}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\mu dp \, p^3 \frac{\Sigma(p)}{p^2 + \Sigma(p)^2} \\ &\sim \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_{2m_C} - \frac{N_{TC}}{2\pi^2} (\mu - 2m_C) m_C^2 \\ &\sim \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_{2m_C} \left(\frac{\mu}{2m_C} \right).\end{aligned}\quad (37)$$

We borrowed the QCD estimate, Eq. (28) because below $2m_C$ the technifermions decouple from the theory and the dynamics should be similar to QCD. We see that there is a linear enhancement of the condensate with renormalization scale, μ . It is this enhancement which is responsible for raising ordinary fermion masses in a WTC theory. Less extreme forms of enhancement are also possible in WTC theories. We comment on these possibilities in our conclusions.

We must also decide whether to trust the estimates, Eq. (24), for the condensates involving the technigluon fields. The hint of the large walking anomalous dimension of the pure technifermion bilinear can be found in the large perturbative anomalous behavior, Eq. (27), present in a running theory. But perturbatively, the mixed condensate has a small anomalous behavior [13], suggesting that it is probably not enhanced to the same degree in WTC as the technifermion bilinear. Therefore Eq. (24) seems to be overestimating in ascribing the same enhancement to the mixed condensates as for the technifermion condensate. To be conservative we will take it as an upper bound on the mixed condensates in order to make our exploratory calculation of S_{WTC} .

(iii) As yet we have not included the effects of the ETC four-technifermion operators which give masses to the PGB's. Their contributions in the OPE can be calculated to first order in the ETC interaction to give

$$\delta_{ETC}\Pi(t) \sim -m_{PGB}^2 f_{TC}^2/t^2, \quad (38)$$

where we have expressed the strength of the ETC operator in terms of m_{PGB}^2 , using chiral perturbation theory [6, 8]. It is a noteworthy feature of WTC theories that PGB masses can be quite large [6]. In this paper we will consider

$$m_{PGB} = m_C. \quad (39)$$

Other possibilities are briefly discussed in our conclusions.

(iv) As in the MTC case, S in WTC will be quite sensitive to f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 for the reason that this determines how much less spectral weight is available to contribute from the axial channel than from the vector channel. Unfortunately, all that is really known is that it is of the same order as in (large- N_C rescaled) QCD [5, 6],

$$(f_{TC}^2/m_C^2)_{WTC} = 0.024gN_{TC}, \quad (40)$$

where $g \sim O(1)$, and we have used the estimate from QCD, Eq. (32).

The final version of the large- t expansion based on all the above general considerations reads (continuing to complex t)

$$\Pi_{WTC}(t) \sim -f_{TC}^2 m_C^2/t^2 - 0.1c N_{TC} m_C^4/t^2 + 0.5d(t) N_{TC} m_C^6/t^3 + 5e(t) N_{TC} m_C^8/t^4 + \dots \quad (41)$$

The first term is due to the ETC perturbation. c is a positive coefficient of order one, parameterizing our uncertainty in C_6 . $d(t), e(t)$ are correction factors for the estimates of the technigluon-technifermion condensates and the higher OPE coefficients. As explained in (ii), it is likely that Eq. (24) is a good bound on these condensates, which corresponds to

$$|d(t)|, |e(t)| \leq 1. \quad (42)$$

We can now proceed to the ACD calculation.

The choice of s_0 is clear. Since the lightest states, other than true Goldstone bosons, coupling to the electroweak currents consist of two PGB's, we can take $s_0 = (2m_{PGB})^2 = (2m_C)^2$. We will trust our expansion at $R = 25m_C^2$. In the range s_0 to R we will use the approximation $1/t \sim P(t)$, where

$$P(t) = 0.41/m_C^2 - 0.054t/m_C^4 + 0.0028t^2/m_C^6 - 5.1 \times 10^{-5}t^3/m_C^8. \quad (43)$$

This is shown in Fig. 3. We emphasize again that the factor $1/t - P(t)$ which appears in the integrand of Eq. (21) strongly weights the integral near the deep Euclidean region where the OPE is expected to be most trustworthy, as shown in Fig. 4. There will be an error in calculating S by the ACD technique due to the fact that $P(t)$ is not exactly $1/t$ in the range s_0 to R . We estimate a bound on this error in appendix 2 and find it to be quite small. The significant uncertainties in S are not inherent to the ACD technique but are due to the uncertainties in the input large- t expansion in WTC. If the first few terms in this expansion were known precisely the ACD technique would give quite a reliable estimate for S .

S can now be computed. The result is

$$S_{WTC} = 4.5N_D f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 - (0.07c \pm 0.02)N_D N_{TC} - 0.03N_D. \quad (44)$$

The $\pm 0.02N_D N_{TC}$ is due to the uncertainty in d, e , which can clearly be absorbed into c . Using Eq. (40) for f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 , leads to our central result,

$$S_{WTC} = (0.11g - 0.07c)N_D N_{TC} - 0.03N_D, \quad (45)$$

where g and c are order-one positive coefficients.

To get a feel for the difference that walking dynamics makes, let us contrast the above result with that for QTC with PGB's of the same mass. The OPE is very similar to that of MTC except the ETC perturbation must be incorporated,

$$\Pi_{QTC}(t) \sim -f_{TC}^2 m_C^2/t^2 + 0.4 N_{TC} m_C^6/t^3 + 2a(t) N_{TC} m_C^8/t^4 + 15b(t) N_{TC} m_C^{10}/t^5 + \dots \quad (46)$$

Using this and the same s_0 and R as before, we obtain

$$S_{QTC} = 4.5 N_D f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 - (0.014 \pm 0.001) N_D N_{TC} - 0.03 N_D. \quad (47)$$

The ± 0.001 is due to the uncertainty in a, b . Using the QCD estimate Eq. (32) for f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 ,

$$S_{QTC} \sim 0.095 N_D N_{TC} - 0.03 N_D. \quad (48)$$

We see that in QTC, the overwhelmingly dominant contribution to S is made by the f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 term. The leading condensate in the large- t expansion of $\Pi(t)$ does very little. However, in WTC the leading term in the expansion (without the ETC perturbation) has been promoted by the large condensate anomalous dimension from a canonically $1/t^3$ term to a $1/t^2$ term. The vanishing of the $1/t^2$ term *asymptotically* leads to the second Weinberg sum rule for the spectrum []. In WTC this sum rule remains true, but the persistence of the $1/t^2$ behavior in the walking regime shows that saturating the second Weinberg sum rule with the low-energy WTC spectrum is invalid. In the ACD formulas of Eqs. (21,22) this promotion is very important, and one can see that it corresponds to a hefty negative contribution to S_{WTC} , $-0.07c N_D N_{TC}$. This is where the sign of C_6 is important, which we argued on general grounds had to be negative. If it had been positive the contribution to S would have been positive.

So, large QTC models certainly have large positive S , as reported in the literature [1, 2], *regardless of any small deviations from an exact QCD resemblance*. This is to be contrasted with WTC which is determined by a cancellation of two large and uncertain contributions, as we see in Eq. (45). All we really know about g and a is that they are order one and positive. Evidently, WTC as described here may or may not be consistent with the current experimental limits on S , depending sensitively on f_{TC}^2/m_C^2 and C_6 .

7 Conclusions

We used the analyticity of the electroweak polarizations to relate their high and low momentum behavior, and the OPE to capture the essential dynamics at high momentum. This led to a formula for S which made transparent the relationship between S and the large anomalous dimensions of the technifermion condensate in walking technicolor. Whereas in large QCD-like technicolor models S is necessarily large and positive, in walking technicolor there is an enhancement of a negative contribution so that S is determined by a large and uncertain cancellation of two competing effects. Because of this it is impossible to say whether or not walking technicolor theories are ruled out by the present experimental limits on S .

We have tried to present a formulation of the theoretical determination of S , and in particular the uncertainties involved, without resort to ad hoc assumptions about the details of the walking technicolor spectrum. We believe that with the present theoretical understanding of walking technicolor, S cannot be determined to greater precision than we have given without making such unjustified assumptions.

Finally we consider how our results would change if (a) some of the PGB's are lighter than we took them to be, or (b) if the walking technicolor model had anomalous dimension smaller than one for the technifermion bilinear. In both cases S will increase.

(a) The contributions to S of two-PGB states lighter than $s_0 = (2m_C)^2$ will be positive as they occur in the vector channel. These contributions can be estimated using a chiral lagrangian with a cutoff of $2m_C$ (see references [1]).

(b) As the anomalous dimension of the fermion bilinear varies between small values and one, the dynamics interpolates between essentially QCD-like technicolor and the extreme form of WTC we considered here, so S should vary accordingly. Thus walking technicolor theories with anomalous dimension less than one would presumably have larger values of S .

If these features are present in realistic walking technicolor theories then S_{WTC} is most likely at least positive. If experiments continue to converge on a large negative value of S , such theories are not likely to be realized in nature.

Recently Appelquist and Triantaphyllou have also estimated S in WTC using a ‘non-local chiral lagrangian’ to capture the essential dynamics [14].

Acknowledgements

We thank R.S. Chivukula, L. Hall, M.A. Luty, S. Narison, M. Peskin, U. Sarid, M. Soldate, M. Suzuki, T. Takeuchi, J. Terning and G. Triantaphyllou for useful conversations. R.S. was supported in part by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC03-76SF00098 and in part by the National Science Foundation under grant PHY90-21139. S.D.H was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant NSF-PHY-87-14654 and the state of Texas under grant PNRLC-RGFY106.

Appendix 1

In order to describe walking dynamics in a large- N_{TC} framework the number of technifermion doublets is taken to increase proportionately to N_{TC} . This means that technifermion loops which are crucial for making the TC gauge coupling ‘walk’ are not forbidden in diagrams at the leading order of $1/N_{TC}$. This is the only modification of standard large- N_{TC} diagrammatics needed in WTC. The virtue of this approximation is that the four-technifermion condensates appearing in the OPE expansion for Π factorize in the leading order of $1/N_{TC}$ into two fermion bilinear condensates. The crucial observation is that all non-factorizeable contributions are obtained from a factorizeable contribution by connecting the two factors with at least one technigluon. This makes them $O(1/N_{TC}^2)$ smaller than the factorized contributions. In this large- N_{TC} approximation we have written all the operators which can occur in the OPE, using the equations of motion acting on the vacuum state to eliminate operators whenever possible.

A discussion of WTC dynamics in this large- N_{TC} approximation is given in ref. [15].

Appendix 2

Here, we address the question of the fit error. The polynomial $P(t)$ is not exactly the same as $1/t$ between s_0 and R . Therefore there is a fit error in computing S given by

$$\delta S = 4N_D \int_{s_0}^R ds \operatorname{Im}\Pi(s)(P(s) - 1/s). \quad (49)$$

It is convenient to write the contributions to the fit error from the vector and axial channels separately, as

$$\delta S_{V,A} = 4N_D \int_{s_0}^R ds \operatorname{Im}\Pi_{V,A}(s)(P(s) - 1/s). \quad (50)$$

In order to bound these contributions, we make the reasonable assumption that the total spectral weight between s_0 and R in each channel is *at most* 50 percent larger than the analogous quantities in (N_C -rescaled) QCD. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{s_0}^R ds \operatorname{Im}\Pi_V(s) &< 0.5N_{TC}m_C^2, \\ \int_{s_0}^R ds \operatorname{Im}\Pi_A(s) &< 0.4N_{TC}m_C^2. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

From Fig. 3, it is clear that

$$|P(s) - 1/s| < 0.01/m_C^2, \quad (52)$$

almost everywhere between s_0 and R . We arrive at the inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} |4N_D \int_{s_0}^R ds \operatorname{Im}\Pi_V(s)(P(s) - 1/s)| &< 0.02N_{TC}N_D \\ |4N_D \int_{s_0}^R ds \operatorname{Im}\Pi_A(s)(P(s) - 1/s)| &< 0.016N_{TC}N_D. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

The net maximal fit error is then $0.036N_{TC}N_D$. It is highly unlikely that this bound is actually saturated, requiring as it does a great conspiracy of the vector and axial spectrum to do so. A more realistic estimate would be about $0.01N_{TC}N_D$. Clearly this does not affect any of the reasoning in the body of the paper.

References

- [1] R. Renken and M. Peskin, Nucl. Phys. B211 (1983) 93; B.W. Lynn, M. Peskin and R.G. Stuart in ‘Physics at LEP’, eds. J. Ellis and R. Peccei (1986); D. Kennedy and B.W. Lynn, Nucl. Phys. B322 (1989) 1; B. Holdom and J. Terning, Phys. Lett. 247B (1990) 88; A. Dobado, D. Espriu and M. Herrero, Phys. Lett. 255B (1990) 405; M. Golden and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. B361 (1991) 3; R. Johnson, B.L. Young and D.W. McKay, Phys. Rev. D43 (1991) R17.
- [2] M. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 (1990) 964; Preprint SLAC-PUB-5618 (1991), T. Takeuchi, Preprint SLAC-PUB-5730 (1992).
- [3] S. Dimopoulos and L. Susskind, Nucl. Phys. B155 (1979) 237.
- [4] E. Eichten and K. Lane, Phys. Lett. 90B (1980) 125; S. Dimopoulos and J. Ellis, Nucl. Phys. B182 (1981) 505.
- [5] B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. 150B (1985) 301; T. Appelquist, D. Karabali and L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. D35 (1987) 2605; M. Bando, T. Morozumi, H. So and K. Yamawaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59 (1987) 389; V.A. Miransky, Nuovo Cimento 90A (1985) 149.
- [6] T. Appelquist and L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. D36 (1987) 568.
- [7] N.F. Nasrallah, N.A. Papadopoulos and K. Schilcher, Phys. Lett. 113B (1982) 61; Z. Phys. C16 (1983) 323; Phys. Lett. 126B (1983) 379; N.F. Nasrallah, N.A. Papadopoulos, J.A. Penarrocha, F. Scheck and K. Schilcher, Phys. Lett. 149B (1984) 213.
- [8] M. Soldate and R. Sundrum, Nucl. Phys. B340 (1990) 1.
- [9] C. Bernard, A. Duncan, J. LoSecco and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D12 (1975) 792.
- [10] V.M. Belyaev and B.L. Ioffe, Sov. Phys. JETP 56 (1982) 493.
- [11] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 18 (1967) 507.

- [12] E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51 (1983) 2351.
- [13] S. Narison and R. Tarrach, Phys. Lett. B125 (1983) 217.
- [14] T. Appelquist and G. Triantaphyllou, Preprint YCTP-P49-91 (1991).
- [15] R. Sundrum, in preparation.

Figure Captions

Figure 1: ACD contours in the complex t plane

Figure 2: Comparison of $P(t)$ and $1/t$ (m_C^{-2}) for MTC plotted against t (m_C^2)

Figure 3: Comparison of $P(t)$ and $1/t$ (m_C^{-2}) for WTC plotted against t (m_C^2)

Figure 4: $\text{Re}(P(t) - 1/t)$ and $\text{Im}(P(t) - 1/t)$ (m_C^{-2}), $t = Re^{i\theta}$, plotted against θ (radians). $\theta = 0$ is the physical t axis.